



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,469	04/20/2001	William D. Huse	P-IX 4692	2981

23601 7590 06/12/2002

CAMPBELL & FLORES LLP
4370 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE
7TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER

BAKER, MAURIE GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1627

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,469

Applicant(s)

Huse et al

Examiner

Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph. D.

Art Unit

1627

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ONE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-38 are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Please Note: In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1627 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is 703-308-4315. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this Pilot program. If you have any questions or suggestions please contact Jyothsna Venkat, Supervisory Patent Examiner, at (703) 308-2439. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a method for determining binding of a receptor to one or more ligands, classified in any of class 435, subclasses 4-29 depending on the receptor and ligand, for example, class 435, subclasses 7.6 or 7.8.
 - II. Claims 10-18, drawn to a method for determining binding of a ligand to one or more receptors, classified in any of class 435, subclasses 4-29 depending on the receptor and ligand, for example, class 435, subclasses 7.6 or 7.8.
 - III. Claims 19-25, drawn to a method for determining binding of a ligand to "a receptor or variant thereof", classified in any of class 435, subclasses 4-29 depending on the receptor and ligand, for example, class 435, subclasses 7.6 or 7.8.
 - IV. Claims 26-31, drawn to a method for identifying an optimal binding ligand variant, classified in any of class 435, subclasses 4-29 depending on the receptor and ligand, for example, class 435, subclasses 6, 7.1 or 7.2.
 - V. Claims 32-38, drawn to a second method for identifying an optimal binding ligand variant, classified in any of class 435, subclasses 4-29 depending on the receptor and ligand, for example, class 435, subclasses 6, 7.1 or 7.2.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other, because of the following reasons:

3. Groups I – V are different methods. The methods are different because they use different steps, require different reagents and will produce different products and/or results. They therefore have different issues regarding patentability and enablement and represent patentably distinct subject matter. The differences between the methods are set forth below.

4. In the instant case, the methods of Groups I, II & III are different from those of Groups IV & V because Groups I, II & III are simply methods to determine binding while Groups III & IV are methods to identify ligands. These methods therefore have different steps and different end results, i.e. the methods of Groups III & IV require additional steps of identifying the ligands and result in the identification of an optimal binding ligand.

5. Group I is different from Groups II & III because Group I is a method for determining binding of a receptor to one or more ligands, while Groups II & III deal with methods for determining binding of a ligand to one or more receptors. Group I involves the use of a collective receptor variant population and Group II involves the use of a collective ligand variant population, which represent different starting materials. Additionally, Group III involves the use of a collective ligand population, without any requirement that this be a variant population, and is furthermore drawn to determining binding to a (single) receptor or variant thereof. In contrast, Group II is drawn to

determining binding to one or more receptors and Group I is drawn to determining binding to one or more ligands.

6. The methods of Groups IV & V are different from each other because they involve different steps and different reagents. Group IV requires contacting the receptor population with a ligand population while Group V requires contacting the receptor population with an individual ligand. Additionally, Group IV further requires dividing the ligand population into subpopulations after detecting binding. Group V has the requirement of dividing the receptor population into subpopulations first, then detecting binding of the individual ligands and finally further dividing these into two or more new subpopulations.

7. These inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter and would require different searches. Please note that even though some of these groups could be classified in the same class/subclass, this has no effect on the non-patent literature search. The different inventions listed would require completely different searches in these databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore an undue search burden exists and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention for **Groups I – V**. Election is required as follows.

9. If applicant elects the invention of **Group I**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Please elect one species from *each* subgroup below. Claims 1-5 and 8 are generic.

Species of “collective receptor variant population”

Applicant is required to elect, for purposes of search, a specific “collective receptor variant population”.

Species of “ligand” type

Applicant is also required to elect, for purposes of search, a specific “ligand” type.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

10. If applicant elects the invention of **Group II**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Please elect one species from *each* subgroup below. Claims 10-14 and 18 are generic.

Species of “collective ligand variant population”

Applicant is required to elect, for purposes of search, a specific “collective ligand variant population”.

Species of “receptor” type

Applicant is also required to elect, for purposes of search, a specific “receptor” type.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

11. If applicant elects the invention of **Group III**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Please elect one species from *each* subgroup below. Claims 19-21 and 25 are generic.

Species of “collective ligand population”

Applicant is required to elect, for purposes of search, a *specific* “collective ligand population”.

Species of “receptor or a variant thereof”

Applicant is also required to elect, for purposes of search, a *specific* “receptor or a variant thereof”.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

12. If applicant elects the invention of **Group IV**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Please elect one species from *each* subgroup below. Claims 26-28 and 30 are generic.

Species of “collective receptor variant population”

Applicant is required to elect, for purposes of search, a *specific* “collective receptor variant population”.

Species of “ligand population”

Applicant is also required to elect, for purposes of search, a *specific* “ligand population”.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

13. If applicant elects the invention of **Group V**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Please elect one species from *each* subgroup below. Claims 32-35 and 37 are generic.

Species of “collective receptor variant population”

Applicant is required to elect, for purposes of search, a *specific* “collective receptor variant population”.

Species of “ligand population”

Applicant is also required to elect, for purposes of search, a *specific* “ligand population”.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

14. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

15. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and *a listing of all claims readable thereon*, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

16. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

17. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

18. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.

19. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim


remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

20. Applicant is also reminded that a 1 - month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for response when a written requirement is made without an action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program, see MPEP 809.02(a).

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:30 to 7:00 and alternate Fridays.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jyothsna Venkat, can be reached on (703) 308-2439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D.
June 10, 2002


MAURIE E. GARCIA, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER



RESTRICTION ELECTION FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE:

FROM/ATTORNEY:

FIRM:

PAGES, INCLUDING COVERSHEET:

PHONE NUMBER:

TO EXAMINER: Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D.

ART UNIT: 1627

SERIAL NUMBER:

FAX/TELECOPIER NUMBER: (703) 308-4315

**PLEASE NOTE: THIS FACSIMILE NUMBER IS TO BE USED ONLY
FOR RESPONSES TO RESTRICTIONS.**

COMMENTS: _____

IF YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED ALL THE PAGES OF THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CONTACT THE ATTORNEY AT THE TELEPHONE NUMBER LISTED ABOVE.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH 1096 OG 30, THE FILING DATE ACCORDED EACH OFFICIAL FAX TRANSMISSION WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE FAX MACHINE DATE STAMP FOUND ON THE LAST PAGE OF THE TRANSMISSION, UNLESS THAT DATE IS A SATURDAY, SUNDAY, OR FEDERAL HOLIDAY WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IN WHICH CASE THE OFFICIAL DATE OF RECEIPT WILL BE THE NEXT BUSINESS DAY.

THE DOCUMENT(S) ACCOMPANYING THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION CONTAIN(S) INFORMATION FROM THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE WHICH IS CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. THIS INFORMATION IS FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR FIRM NAMED ON THIS SHEET. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISCLOSURE, COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, OR THE TAKING OF ANY ACTION IN RELIANCE ON THE CONTENTS OF THIS INFORMATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THE DOCUMENTS SHOULD BE RETURNED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IMMEDIATELY. IF THIS FACSIMILE IS RECEIVED IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY THE ATTORNEY LISTED HEREON IMMEDIATELY.